

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/601,611		06/23/2003	Sigmund Kulessa	022719-0042	022719-0042 8723	
21125	7590	06/15/2006		EXAMINER		
		NNEN & FISH LLP ENTER WEST		MENDEZ, MANUEL A		
155 SEAPO				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BOSTON, I	MA 022	10-2604		3763		
				DATE MAILED, 06/15/2004	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			E
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,611	KULESSA, SIGMUND	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manuel Mendez	3763	
- The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed on the mailing date of this communication NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 A	A <i>pril</i> 2006.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Thi	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	•		S
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	cepted or b) objected to by the	e Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E			(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	its have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	• •		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		ived in this National Stage	
application from the International Burea		d	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not recei	veu.	
Attachment(s)	»□·····	(270.440)	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail	ry (PTO-413) Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date		I Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/601,611

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tate in view of Huss et al., Buyers, Hooven et al., or Yarger, and in further view of Santini, Jr. et al., (5797898), Santini, Jr. et al., (6123861), or Santini, Jr. et al. (6551838).

The Tate patent does not disclose filter material disposed around an inner diameter of the catheter and extending between the proximal and distal ends of the catheter. However, the designing catheters having filters extending within the inner lumen of a catheter or at the proximal end of the catheter is conventional in the art as evidenced by the teachings of **Huss et al., and Buyers.**

Huss et al., shows in figures 7 a catheter having filters along the longitudinal axis of the catheter. Additionally, Buyers show a catheter design having a filter at the proximal end of the catheter.

Based on the above observations, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, modifying the catheter disclosed by Tate with filters located alongside the inner lumen or in the proximal end of the catheter would have been considered obvious in view of the conventionality of these enhancements.

Application/Control Number: 10/601,611

Art Unit: 3763

The examiner included Hooven et al., and Yarger to demonstrate the conventionality of designing catheters with rows of ports in the distal end. Again, these particular port arrangements would have been considered obvious in view of the conventionality of these port enhancements.

Page 3

Finally, the Santini, Jr. et al. patents demonstrate the conventionality of using a fluid impermeable barriers disposed in and occluding selected fluid entry ports, the barriers being selectively removable with respect to each of the selected fluid entry ports. Based on the above observations, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, modifying the barrier system used in Tate with a removable membrane that removes the membrane after the application of electric current, as taught by the Santini Jr. et al. patents, would have been considered obvious in view of the conventionality of this enhancement.

In view of the new art utilized in the above rejection, this action is not a final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manuel Mendez whose telephone number is 703-308-2221. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800 hrs.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Brian Casler can be reached on 703-308-3552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/601,611

Art Unit: 3763

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manuel Mende'z

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3763

MM